

# Modeling Team-Development Lifecycle in Public Administration Courses

Maja Husar Holmes  
*West Virginia University*

## ABSTRACT

During the course of their academic experience, public administration students are expected to work as teams in order to complete projects and embrace a team-based philosophy for addressing public needs. Traditional team-development pedagogy omits a critical piece for future public administrators – developing team-development skills and competence through explicit reflection, modeling, and analysis of the team-development lifecycle. This paper demonstrates how modeling the team development lifecycle within a course setting — forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning (Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977) — encourages students to explore the team-development process, and to experience and reflect on corresponding emotional and behavioral responses at the various team-development stages. By explicitly modeling the strategies in the context of an entire class serving as a single team, students develop a greater confidence and competence to engage future team-development opportunities. This article (a) articulates a strategy for how to model the team-development lifecycle in public administration courses, (b) identifies anticipated affective responses, and (c) offers examples of lessons learned, so that instructors can apply this pedagogical approach.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Public administration curricula have a rich tradition of students working in teams. Courses in public administration programs employ student teams to examine public policy and management issues (Goodman, 2008) and develop “craft skills” (Vining & Weimer, 2002). Team projects encourage students to be “problem-solvers, capable of independent learning and teamwork, able to conduct and utilize research, and to communicate effectively” (Boyer, 2001, p. 2). One way that public administration courses model team development

is through the process of completing consulting (Allard & Straussman, 2003; Selden & Sandfort, 2002; Cohen, Eimike, & Ukeles, 1995) and service-learning projects (Lambright, 2008) with non-profit and public agency sponsors. The rationale for incorporating team-based pedagogy in public administration is two-fold. First, the process of working in teams improves the learning outcomes for understanding content through experiential learning, which engages students not to just read and discuss concepts, but to apply concepts (Holmer & Adams, 1995; Cunningham, 1997). Second, contemporary public administrators are expected to work in teams to provide government services, solve problems, and improve organizational processes (Koehler & Pankowski, 1996).

The need for greater competence by public managers regarding team development is reflected in the nature of public work. As Abel (2009, p. 157) recently suggested, students of public administration

... must learn how to thrive on chaos, to make rapid decisions based on incomplete and biased information, to resolve novel situations as apprehensive parties clamor to secure their interests, and to collaborate with a team of fellow bureaucrats as they identify, share and master a situation that is filtered through a fog of quasi-accurate information (2009, p. 157).

Current pedagogical approaches are not necessarily meeting the needs of students and public administrators to (a) effectively work as a team on non-profit boards (Jacobson & Warner, 2008), (b) use team facilitation skills to build and manage collaborative public networks (Bingham, Sandfort, & O'Leary, 2008) and develop affective leadership in teams (Newman, Guy, & Mastracci, 2009).<sup>1</sup>

Extant research on team-development competence reflects the challenges of current pedagogical approaches. A 2007 survey of Master of Public Administration (MPA) curricula suggests that "courses having a direct focus on the development of negotiation skills and team building should be offered in more programs and in a more intensive way to help strengthen public managers' communicative and coordinative capabilities" (Holzer & Lin, 2007, p. 361). Even when team development is emphasized in MPA courses, it is not clear whether existing pedagogical strategies are effectively developing students' abilities to work in teams. Schumaker (2005) found that only one-third of the MPA students studied perceived that working in teams increased their ability to effectively work elsewhere on a team. Moreover, traditional approaches towards team development also might reinforce a dislike and distrust of working in teams (Donovan, 1998). The result is that public administration students feel less empowered and less competent when they work in teams.

There are several reasons why traditional methods of instilling team-

development skills and confidence are not effective. First, and most important, the team-development process is subject to the “Wizard of Oz” effect. The students are expected to work in teams, yet there is no explicit encouragement to “pull back the curtain” and begin to understand what drives team processes, relationships, and outcomes. The assumption is that by simply providing opportunities for students to work in teams, they will improve their team-development skills. Empirical evidence suggests that instructors need to intervene (Bosworth & Hamilton, 1996), to model team development (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989; Bork & Kim, 1998), and to explicitly discuss and reflect on team management techniques (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Second, much of the emphasis of team projects is on the results, rather than the process. Third, there is limited opportunity to reflect on the team’s development challenges, strategies, and opportunities. The sequencing of team development is one of the key tenets of understanding team dynamics (Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977; Hare, 1976; LaCoursiere, 1980; McGrath, 1984).

This article focuses on the Tuckman typology of sequencing team development — forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning (Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977) – in order to model and explore the team development process, and reflect on corresponding emotional and behavioral responses at various team-development stages. The Tuckman model is the most well-known model for understanding the team development lifecycle. By explicitly modeling and adopting strategies in the context of the entire class as a team, public administration students develop greater confidence and competence for engaging in future team-development opportunities.

The next section of this article articulates a strategic framework for modeling the team-development lifecycle in public administration courses. I identify specific pedagogical devices and discuss the anticipated affective responses by students for each stage of the team-development lifecycle. The paper concludes with articulated student outcomes and lessons learned for instructors to apply this pedagogical approach.

#### APPLICATION OF TEAM-DEVELOPMENT LIFECYCLE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION COURSES

The impetus for this paper stemmed from a graduate-level course on Team Development and Facilitation. The explicit emphasis on team development in that course offered fruitful research opportunities to explore the impact of modeling and reflect on the team-development lifecycle — specifically as it applies to improving the team’s process, outcome and relationships. I have used this pedagogical approach in four sections of the Team Development and Facilitation course, and class sizes have ranged from 7 to 19. Because the purpose of the approach is to use the entire class population as a single-team model, the ideal class size for effectively implementing this approach is 10 to 15 students.

My experience is that a class with less than 10 students promotes a groupthink mental model. Class sizes exceeding 15 students increase the potential for free riders in the process.

Based on my experience in the Team Development and Facilitation course, I have applied the team-development lifecycle approach to other public administration, graduate-level courses, including Public Administration and Policy, Public Management, Public Leadership, and Human Resource Management. This approach is amenable to most other public administration courses, regardless of the subject matter. The major limitation of applying this approach is the number of students enrolled in the course. Most core courses in public administration enroll more than 15 students, but this approach may not be appropriate for courses with large enrollments. Aside from this, the team-development stages and strategies outlined in the following sections can be adapted to a variety of public administration and policy courses.

#### FORMING

Instructors generally conduct some form of introductory activity on the first day of class, followed by an overview of the course syllabus. The introduction is usually done round-robin style, where each student states his/her name, academic program, and maybe one personal fact. The result of this initial activity is that (1) each student is more focused on thinking about what s/he is saying or going to say, and (2) students rarely pay attention to what other students have expressed about themselves. After introductions, the instructor traditionally follows up with a detailed description of course expectations and requirements. The immediate dissection of the course syllabus makes it implicit that the course outcome is based on how well individual students meet the expected course requirements. Relying on these two activities assumes that relationship-building in this case is between the student and the instructor, not between the students themselves. If a class is to develop as a team and explore affective leadership through team development, the introductory activities must be expanded and reoriented to emphasize relationship-building among the students.

Suggested tactics for the forming stage are as follows.

- Introduce yourself as the instructor and lay out an agenda for the first class.
- Allow students to briefly introduce themselves to the group.
- Facilitate a brainstorming activity on one of the main topics of the course. Examples include questions about “What is public administration?” “Who is a public administrator?”
- Conduct a Snow Card activity<sup>2</sup> asking students to reflect upon “What do you expect to gain from the course?” and “What specific skill do you want to gain from the course?” I ask each student to post the snow cards on the wall and then select two students to facilitate categorizing the responses.

- The snow card activity serves as a bridge to introduce the syllabus, and highlights some of the responses identified. This activity explicitly requires students to reflect on their own commitment to the course and understand the interests of the other students.
- Have students conduct interview dyads, where the student partners ask each other “Where do you call home?” and “How did you get your name?” and “What does your name mean to you?” Paired students then introduce their partners by sharing their partner’s responses with the class as a whole.
- Follow up the dyads with a group reflection on the exercise.

Behavioral hallmarks in the forming stage of team development are polite interactions that emphasize responding to specific directives. Students’ attitudes towards each other and the instructor tend to be distant. Students may look to the instructor for specific instructions, but they also find behavioral clues in the class. For example, if I expect students to develop interactive exercises in presenting course concepts, then my pedagogical approach must model interaction and exploration. To emphasize the importance of the forming phase of team development, start with safe, low-commitment activities in the early stages, and build up to activities that require a greater degree of trust. Introductory activities are not constrained to the first day of class. In order to effectively engage the students in the forming phase of team development, introductory activities should be spread out across the first several course meeting days.

#### STORMING

Most instructors do not intentionally initiate the storming phase. More likely they shy away from it, because the storming phase usually includes agitation and frustration directed towards the instructor. Students may begin to grumble about the reading load or the lack of clarity in assignment guidelines. The manifested conflict that occurs in all courses also takes several forms, such as avoidance, direct confrontation, or even negotiation. In modeling the team-development process, I find it imperative not only to embrace the storming phase but also to explicitly orchestrate it. The key to triggering a storming phase that evokes affective behavior is to find an activity the students collectively have a vested interest in. Most courses require students to do some form of presentation based on a paper, project, or course reading. I use the course presentation format and evaluation requirements as a trigger for the storming phase. In the course syllabus, the only guidelines for presentation are the statement that each student must do one, and that the presentation represents a certain percentage of the final grade.

Suggested tactics for the storming phase include the following.

- Instruct the class that as a team they must develop specific guidelines for

the presentation format and evaluation criteria.

- Assign a student to facilitate the decision-making process.
- As the instructor, sit quietly in a corner and deflect any questions asked of you for clarification. (I also usually leave the room for a couple of minutes during the exercise to get some water. This reinforces the instructor's detachment from the process and outcome).
- Accept the student's guidelines and debrief this activity (this exercise may take more than an hour-and-a-half).

Behavioral trademarks in the storming stage include frustration, impatience, and even detachment. For example, students initially expect the introductory activity to last for 20 minutes or so, and, as the process drags on, they show visible signs of agitated affective behaviors. There is a tendency for students to both explicitly and implicitly look for guidance and resolution from the instructor. Yet, it is the instructor's ability to be distanced from the activity that enables students to identify both positive and negative affective leadership, to practice interpersonal interventions that promote team development, and to develop process-management strategies. The activity elicits students' personal views and interests, and juxtaposes them with their peers' values. The students' transition, from a low degree of commitment to their collective-learning outcomes, to a higher degree of commitment, is critical for them to understand the impact of affective leadership in the team-development process and its impact on relationship-building and related results.

#### NORMING

Transitioning from the *storming* to the *norming* phase of a team-development lifecycle reflects an explicit attempt to (a) reconcile conflicts, (b) develop process-management tools, and (c) improve communication among team members. This phase requires students collectively to embrace responsibility for defining their learning outcomes and processes. While the storming phase highlights differences in student values, interests, and needs, the norming phase establishes a shared vision for what they hope to gain from the course. It also reiterates student-to-student relationships, rather than instructor-to-student relationships.

The following lists some suggested tactics for the norming phase.

- Share responsibility for covering course material by assigning students to work in dyads and triads to present course concepts in an interactive manner. Specifically, students in this phase (a) cannot use Microsoft Office PowerPoint presentations, (b) must engage the whole class in an activity, and (c) also must include discussion questions that examine the impact and relevance of their selected concept.
- Invite input on the course by modeling a variety of feedback mechanisms,

such as plus/deltas,<sup>3</sup> opportunities for anonymous suggestions, and by asking students to write down “What questions are unanswered?”

- Support the student ideas articulated during feedback forums by empowering them to take action on their input. This can be as simple as a student seeking input from classmates on changing the seating layout of the classroom.

Behavioral traits evident during the norming phase include increased confidence for proposing ideas and suggestions, as well as verbal acknowledgement and appreciation of peer strengths, views, and values. As the instructor continues to actively model team-development strategies and frame reflective questions with the class, the instructor increasingly cedes control of the pace, focus, and content of the course. It is during the norming phase that new topics emerge for class examination, and course expectations also evolve. For example, students begin to offer unsolicited suggestions on how to manage the agenda for the class meetings, and frequently add topics for further discussion.

#### PERFORMING

The only way to know if a class has reached the performing stage of team development is simply to let go. The result is not always positive. On some occasions, control is completely relinquished to the student team, and on other occasions the instructor must guide a student team back through the development process. Student teams that have developed affective leadership are defined by their ability to (a) constructively challenge each other, (b) move the process forward, and (c) acknowledge personal assumptions, biases, and values in order to establish trust.

Suggested tactics for the performing phase include the following.

- Devolve facilitation duties to the students, and ask them to conduct idea-generation activities, manage decision-making processes, and guide reflection and feedback sessions.
- Observe how the students monitor their performance, process improvements, and engage in relationship-building skills.

Behavioral characteristics seen during the performing phase include explicitly articulating and acting upon a team member’s strengths and weaknesses by (a) identifying team roles, (b) supporting student-initiated changes, and (c) actively seeking out dissenting opinions. During the performing stage, there is a collective sense of trust in working through the team process, and in the idea that a satisfactory outcome is within reach.

#### ADJOURNING

Equally important to the process of forming and developing teams is the

process of adjourning them. The final stage of the team-development lifecycle requires a great deal of affective leadership in order to (a) retain lessons learned from the process and outcome and (b) apply these lessons to future professional endeavors. If done improperly, team members are often left with a sense of “let down,” and even experience decreased confidence in their abilities to effectively participate in team development. The adjourning phase reflects completion and disengagement from both the tasks and the team members. They need to recognize — both individually and as a team — (a) what they’ve done, (b) the meaning of the outcome, and (c) their conscious decision to move on.

The following lists some suggested tactics for the adjourning phase.

- Review team accomplishments by referring back to the Snow Card activity in the forming stage, where students articulated “What do you expect to gain from the course?” and/or “What specific skill do you want to gain from the course?”
- Reflect on lessons learned both individually and collectively, for that can serve as a bridge to their next leadership/team-development opportunity.
- Create take-away mementos that symbolize closure, and that also highlight the legacy of team experience. Examples of take-away mementos include a collective list of lessons learned, or a portfolio of critical strategies and activities (as articulated by the students) needed for applying the course subject to an actual practice.

The adjourning phase inspires a complex set of emotions that span the emotional spectrum of relief, uncertainty, celebration, and reluctance to move forward. Acknowledging the range of emotions via activities designed to foster the adjourning stage is a critical process for developing effective team development skills. Adjourning creates personal connections to course material and generates insights for individuals to use in future opportunities.

#### ARTICULATED STUDENT OUTCOMES

As described in the adjourning phase of the team-development lifecycle, I conclude each course with a lessons-learned activity, where students describe the specific skills, tools, and insights they gained from the course. I have collected these lessons-learned from more than 10 courses where I modeled the team-development lifecycle. When juxtaposed with students’ initial expectations — expressed during the forming stage — the lessons learned show the progress that has been made toward remedying the persistent challenges of instilling effective team-development skills and attitudes in public administration curriculum.

The lessons-learned articulate three trends in student outcomes.

- First, students begin to see “behind the curtain” of team development.

Their initial perceptions about the multiple dimensions of the team-development process are unclear, and their initial discussion of expectations is generally vague. Students generally express an interest in “learning how to deal with conflict” and in “learning how to manage an organization.” By modeling the team-development lifecycle via the application of and reflection upon specific activities, students begin to understand all the components necessary for effective team development. They gain a more comprehensive knowledge of what is critical to team development, as illustrated by the following student’s lesson-learned: “Culture matters, in that it is where the words are moved into action, and involves recruiting, incentives, and decision-making, but it can also be a barrier to change.”

- Second, reflecting upon Donovan’s (1998) research that traditional pedagogy to engage students in teamwork tends to breed a greater dislike for teamwork, I was pleasantly surprised to see that students articulated a positive change in their attitudes toward teamwork. After using the team-development lifecycle approach in public administration courses, one student’s comment captured this changed attitude: “I learned the importance of teamwork as a whole. I used to prefer to work alone. Now I see greater value in teams.”
- Finally, students expressed a greater awareness of how their own affective and emotional behaviors impact the effectiveness of team development and, in turn, public administration. For example, the concept of patience is critical to effective team development. One student reflected the need to “encourage the time-out when things are heading or beginning to head south. Allow for the stop, backup, and regroup.” The importance of students monitoring the behavioral responses of themselves, as well as other team members, also gained acceptance.

#### LESSONS LEARNED

Explicitly incorporating and modeling the team-development lifecycle in public administration courses was instrumental in cultivating students who not only want to work on teams, but who also have the skills and affective acumen successfully to do so. Adopting this approach in the classroom, however, may require a significant shift in the instructor’s pedagogical approach. When adopting the team-development lifecycle approach in public administration courses, three critical lessons emerged to ensure the success of the approach.

#### *Embrace Ceding Control*

Traditional public administration courses allow for a great deal of instructional control over course curricula, discussion questions, and the pace of presenting new material. The team-development lifecycle approach requires

instructors ultimately to cede control of these elements to the students. Initially, this can be very uncomfortable for instructors. It requires them to be patient, to embrace uncertainty, and to give students time for processing their new-found control. In the end, though, this control is a powerful tool for students to experience, as they reflect on their collective behavioral responses and build confidence for facing future team-development and leadership opportunities.

### *Model Adaptive Learning*

In much the same way that instructors are uncomfortable with relinquishing control in the classroom, students generally are hesitant about embracing responsibility for their classroom learning experiences. Students typically expect to be guided through the process by an instructor. When instructors reinforce the process of guiding, they provide a disservice to public administration students, who likely will face public service duties without a definitive guide, and under conditions of uncertainty and chaos (Abel, 2009). Instructors must model adaptive-learning strategies in the forming and storming stages, which encourage students to accept responsibility for their collective learning experiences. Adaptive learning requires individuals to (a) check assumptions and inferences, (b) be transparent with their individual thoughts and feelings, and (c) acknowledge differences by making room for dialogue and dissent. As students assume responsibility for the course content and process, they establish a culture that applies the tools of adaptive learning. While transitioning the responsibility to the students, instructors need to resist temptations to clarify details or make suggestions, for resisting this temptation enables students to decide how to move forward, deal with emotions, address collective norms, and develop joint accountability for the situation and its consequences.

### *Make It Personal*

Although this is one of the hardest lessons to learn, it seems to have the greatest impact, based on my experiences with student reactions. Bringing the team-development lifecycle to the surface generates opportunities to directly engage behaviors that become critical, teachable moments. When students get frustrated, excited, or disengaged, don't be afraid to call them on their individual behaviors and actions. This process uses the delicate balance of focusing on a behavior — not a person — as the source of demonstrating specific concepts. The result provides an immediate and direct way of linking affective behavior to the team-development process. One of the most powerful examples of applying this method is when a student resists participating in the team-development process (which is not uncommon). Engaging a student directly enables an individual to reflect on personal emotions and behaviors in the team-development process.

## CONCLUSION

Contemporary public administration reflects a necessity for public service professionals to serve as members of various program, policy, and governance teams, and to successfully navigate the team-development process. Re-envisioning public administration courses to explicitly model and adopt strategies — using the context of an entire class as a team — introduces students to specific techniques of navigating through the team-development stages. The framework also enables students to actively acknowledge and reflect on the affective behaviors of themselves and their peers, while they develop as a team. This approach — as evidenced by student reflections at the end of my courses — enables public administration students to gain confidence and increase their competence for engaging in future team-development opportunities.

## REFERENCES

- Abel, C.F. (2009). Toward a signature pedagogy for public administration. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 15*(2), 145-160.
- Allard, S.W., & Straussman, J.D. (2003). Managing intensive student consulting capstone projects: The Maxwell School experience. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 22*(4), 689-701.
- Beck, A. (2006, March 3). Teaching across multiple approaches. Paper presented at the 2006 Kentucky Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Richmond, KY.
- Bingham, L.B., Sandfort, J., & O'Leary, R. (2008). Learning to do and doing to learn: Teaching managers to collaborate in networks. In R. O'Leary & L.B. Bingham, (Eds.). *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management* (pp. 270-285). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bosworth, K. & Hamilton, S.J. (Eds.). (1996). *Collaborative learning: Underlying processes and effective techniques*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bork, C.J., & Kim, K.A. (1998). Extending sociocultural theory to adult learning. In M.C. Smith and T. Pourchot (Eds). *Adult learning and development: Perspectives from educational psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Boyer, N.E. (2001, February 4). A new pedagogy for a new millennium: Problem-based learning. Paper presented at 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Teaching Public Administration, Tempe, AZ.
- Chapman, K.J., & Van Auken, S. (2001). Creating positive group project experiences: An examination of the role of the instructor on student's perceptions of group projects. *Journal of Marketing Education, 23*(2), 117-127.
- Cohen, S., Eimicke, W., & Ukeles, J. (1995). Teaching the craft of policy and management analysis: The workshop sequence at Columbia University's graduate program in public policy and administration. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 14*(4), 606-626.
- Colbeck, C. J., Campbell, S.E., & Bjorklund, S.A. (2000). Grouping in the dark: What college students learn from group projects. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(1), 60-83.

## *Modeling Team-Development Lifecycle in Public Administration Courses*

- Collins, A., Brown, J.S., & Newman, S.E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing and mathematics. In L.B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453-494). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cunningham, R. (1997). Experiential learning in public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Education*, 3(2), 219-228.
- Denhardt, R.B. (2001). The big questions in public administration education. *Public Administration Review*, 61(5), 526-624.
- Denhardt, R.B., & Denhardt, J.V. (2006). *The dance of leadership: The art of leading in business, government, and society*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Donovan, C.P. (1998). Developing high performing teams in the public management classroom. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 4(2), 147-156.
- Flynn, T.A., Sandfort, J.R., & Selden, S.C. (2001). A three-dimensional approach to learning in public management. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(3), 551-564.
- Goodman, D. (2008). Problem-based learning in MPA curriculum. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 14(2), 253-270.
- Hare, A.P. (1976). *Handbook of small group research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Helminski, L., & Koberna, S. (1995). Total quality in instruction: A systems approach. In H.V. Roberts (Ed.), *Academic initiatives in total quality for higher education* (pp. 309-362). Milwaukee, WI: ASQC Quality Press.
- Holmer, L.L., & Adams, G.A. (1995). The practice gap: Strategy and theory for emotional and interpersonal development in public administration education. *Journal of Public Administration Education*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Holzer, M., & Lin, W. (2007). A longitudinal perspective on MPA education in the United States. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 13(2), 345-364.
- Jacobson, W.S., & Warner, D. (2008). Leading and governing: A model for local government education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 14(2), 149-173.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1989). Social skills for successful group work. *Educational Leadership*, 46(4), 29-33.
- LaCoursiere, R.B. (1980). *The life cycle of groups: Group development stage theory*. New York, NY: Human Sciences Press.
- Lambright, K. (2008). Lessons outside of the classroom: Examining the effectiveness of service learning projects at achieving learning objectives. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 14(2), 205-217.
- Koehler, J.W., & Pankowski, J.M. (1996). *Teams in government*. Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press.
- McGrath, J.E. (1986). Studying groups at work: Ten critical needs for theory and practice. In P.S. Goodman and Associates (Eds.), *Designing effective work groups* (pp. 363-392). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Newman, M.A., Guy, M.E., & Mastracci, S.H. (2009). Beyond cognition: Affective leadership and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 6-20.
- Shumaker, A. (2005). In search of a model for effective group projects: From the MPA perspective. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11(1), 21-34.
- Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384-99.
- Tuckman, B.W., & Jensen, M.C. (1977). Stages of small group development revisited. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 2, 419- 427.
- Vining, A.R., & Weimer, D.L. (2002). Introducing policy analysis craft: The sheltered workshop. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(4), 697-707.

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The concept of *affective* leadership contends that people “are rarely ‘energized’ without some kind of an emotional commitment. For this to happen, the leader must trigger, stimulate, or evoke an emotional response on the part of potential followers so that those people will become engaged and active... The capacity to energize others through touching the emotions is the key to the art of leadership” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2006, 18). A critical component of affective leadership is the capacity for artful affect, which “involves managing one’s own affect as well as that of the other person in the exchange. Practicing artful affect is both proactive and reactive. It requires the artful sensing of the other’s emotional state and crafting of one’s own affective expressions so as to elicit the desired response on the part of the other” (Newman, Guy, & Mastracci, 2009, p. 14).
- <sup>2</sup> The Snow Card technique is a brainstorming activity that encourages participants individually to offer input and then work as a group to categorise the responses. Each individual writes her/his responses to a brainstorming question on a self-adhesive note. The notes are posted on a board. A facilitator reads each each card out loud and asks the group to identify which responses fit together to create categories of responses.
- <sup>3</sup> Plus/Delta is a quick and easy tool that typically is used at the end of a class period to gather information. Ask students to identify what is working in the course to advance their learning, and what could be improved by the teacher and the students. It helps students to think about their responsibility to the course, what they should continue doing to learn (PLUS), and what they need to change for the course to improve for them (DELTA) (Helminski & Koberna, 1995).

Maja Husar Holmes, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Division of Public Administration at West Virginia University. Her research and teaching interests reflect the intersection of leadership, public participation, and collaborative public management.